

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended, essentially to recite that the claimed engagement feature is "circumferentially partial," for clarity over the previous recitation that the feature is "discrete."

No other claims have been amended; claims 2-9, 11 and 12 remain in their original form, while claims 13 and 14 were canceled in Applicants' previous reply.

Accordingly, claims 1-12 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 10 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Japanese Unexamined Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003-258473 to Yoshiyasu Sasa.

The present rejection repeats the rejection made in the previous Office action on the merits (mailed November 1, 2005), except that the revised language of claims 1 and 10, added by amendment in Applicants' previous reply, (submitted February 1, 2006) has been substituted into the text of the rejection *mutatis mutandis*.

Under the "Response to Arguments" section, the Office action addresses Applicants' previous amended language of claims 1 and 10. In particular, the Office action states with regard to claim 1 that "[T]he claim as worded does not overcome the [rejection]," and with regard to claim 10 that "[T]he claim as worded does not distinguish it over Sasa's disclosure."

Namely, the Office's position with regard to claim 1 was that to say that *at least one* fin defines *at least one* discrete engagement feature could, strictly speaking, be interpreted as saying that each individual fin defines a "discrete engagement feature."

Likewise, with regard to claim 10 the Office's position was that to say that *select ones* of the fins define *a plurality of* discrete engagement features could, strictly speaking, be interpreted as saying that each individual fin along the entire circumference of the heat sink is a "select" one of the fins, and presumably that each "select" fin defines one of the plurality of discrete engagement features, the plurality being equal to the number of fins.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that "a plurality of circumferentially adjacent heat radiating fins" is claimed, and has been reworded to recite that

at least one circumferentially partial engagement feature is formed along the envelope of the heat sink by distal-edge protrusions or recesses in a group of the heat radiating fins, for engagement with the engaging portion of the arm portion.

Claim 10 has also been amended to clarify that "a plurality of circumferentially adjacent heat radiating fins" is claimed, and in a manner corresponding to the rewording of claim 1 now recites that

a plurality of circumferentially partial engagement features is formed along the envelope of the heat sink by distal-edge protrusions or recesses in groups of the heat radiating fins, for engagement with the engaging portion of the plurality of arm portions.

It is respectfully submitted that the language of amended claims 1 and 10 clearly distinguishes the present invention over the configuration illustrated in the Sasa reference. In particular, Sasa does not disclose one or a plurality of circumferentially partial engagement features, formed in a group or in groups of heat radiating fins constituting a cooling-fan heat sink.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 2; Sasa '473

Claims 3-12; Sasa '473 in view of Ogawara et al. '007

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Sasa reference, cited by the Office in making the § 102 rejections addressed above, in view of knowledge possessed by one skilled in the art.

Claims 3-9, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasa in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,419,007 to Ogawara et al.

It is respectfully submitted that for the reasons presented in addressing the § 102 rejections, the patentability of the present application rests in claims 1 and 10 to begin with, and that the present reply is fully responsive to the separate rejections under § 103 of claim 2 and of claims 3-9, 11 and 12, in that claims 2 through 9, and 11 and 12 should be held allowable as depending directly or indirectly from claim 1 or claim 10.

App. No. 10/708,400
Amendment dated June 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 21, 2006

Accordingly, Applicant courteously urges that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is requested. Favorable action by the Examiner at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

June 21, 2006

/James Judge/

James W. Judge
Registration No. 42,701

JUDGE & MURAKAMI IP ASSOCIATES
Dojima Building, 7th Floor
6-8 Nishitemma 2-Chome, Kita-ku
Osaka-shi 530-0047
JAPAN

Telephone: **305-938-7119**
Voicemail/Fax: **703-997-4565**